REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-11 are rejected. Claims 1-11 are objected to. New claims 12 and 13 are added. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to change mm to μm as requested by the Examiner. Claims 1, 5, 6, and 11 were amended to place them in better form. New claims 12 and 13 have been added. The specification and claims 6 and 11 have been amended to correct a typographical error.

Claims 1-11 have been objected to for reciting "mm" instead of "μm" for the particle size. Appropriate correction has been made.

Claims 1-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,153,288 (Shih et al.) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0039306 (Nozaki et al.).

Claim 1 recites an aqueous-emulsion-type acrylic pressure-sensitive adhesive. Shih et al. is directed to an EVA emulsion polymer. The Office Action has not identified any disclosure in Shih et al. that the emulsion polymer in Shih et al. is an acrylic pressure-sensitive adhesive. The Office Action states that Nozaki et al. discloses dispersions that provide easy coating by impregnation and that therefore it would be obvious to use the ethylene-vinyl acetate-acrylic ester copolymers disclosed in Nozaki et al. in the invention of Shih et al. However, Shih et al. is directed to an ink-receptive composition and Nozaki et al. is directed to a flame retardant for mesh sheets. One of ordinary

skill in the art would not look to the art of flame retardants to modify an invention relating to ink-receptive compositions, especially since there is no disclosure in Shih et al. of the composition recited therein being applied to mesh sheets. The references are directed to nonanalogous art and therefore there is no reason for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them.

Furthermore, Nozaki et al. discloses the use of EVA as does Shih et al. No reason has been provided to replace the EVA disclosed in Shih et al. with the acrylic disclosed in Nozaki et al. especially since Nozaki et al. also discloses the use of EVA. No advantage has been identified by using the acrylic disclosed in Nozaki et al. instead of the EVA disclosed in Shih et al. or the EVA disclosed in Nozaki et al.

Furthermore, the Office Action states that the dispersions of Nozaki et al. have the solids content and particle diameter as recited in claim 1 and that it would be obvious to use those dispersions in the invention of Shih et al. The resins in Nozaki et al. are mixed with different components than the resins of Shih et al. For example, the Abstract of Nozaki et al. discloses a composition with 40 to 130 parts by weight of an ammonium polyphosphate compound based on 100 parts of resin aqueous dispersion, and 60 to 150 parts of a metal hydroxide based on 100 parts of the solid content of the resin aqueous dispersion. Accordingly, since the use of the resin is different in Nozaki et al.

and in Shih et al., one of ordinary skill in the art would not choose to have the same solids content and particle size in Shih et al. as in Nozaki et al.

Accordingly, for the aforementioned reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Shih et al. in view of Nozaki et al. and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 6, the Office Action states that the poly(allyldimethylammonium chloride) disclosed in column 8, lines 13-16 of Shih et al. reads on the recitation of claim 6 of a polymer of a salt of $CH_2=CH-CH_2-NHR$. Applicant disagrees with this contention. Column 8, lines 13-16 of Shih et al. disclose a polydiallyldimethylammonium chloride. Moreover, formulas (I)-(III) of column 3 of Shih et al. represent the diallyldimethylammonium compounds disclosed in Shih et al. As is clear from column 8, lines 13-16 and formulas (I)-(III) of Shih et al., the disclosure of Shih et al. is to a diallyl. In contrast, the formula of $CH_2=CH-CH_2-NHR$ in claim 6 is not a diallyl and therefore a polymer of a salt of $CH_2=CH-CH_2-NHR$ also does not disclose a diallyl. Accordingly, claim 6 is patentable over the cited art and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 is patentable for the same reasons as claim 1 and claim 11 is patentable for the same reasons as claim 6. Notice of the patentability of claims 7 and 11 is also respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5 and 8-10 are patentable at least for the reason that they depend from a patentable base claim. *See In re Fine*, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

New claims 12 and 13 have been added and recite that the emulsifying agent is an anionic surfactant, as disclosed on page 8, first full paragraph of the specification. In contrast, Shih et al. discloses in column 5, lines 9-11 that anionic surfactants should be avoided. Accordingly, Shih et al. teaches away from the recitation of claims 12 and 13. Thus, claims 12 ane 13 are patentable over Shih et al. in view of Nozaki et al. and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Additionally, claims 12 and 13 are patentable at least for the reason that they depend from patentable base claims.

Applicant respectfully requests a three month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. **The fee of $525.00 for the extension is provided for with the Request for Continued Examination submitted concurrently herewith.** The USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicants

By and,

By Ricardo Unikel
Ricardo Unikel
Reg. No. 52,309
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340